

A mini writing
by
Arthur Sawyer Cage

Zero-Conspiracy Theorization



Zero-Conspiracy Theorization

Zero-conspiracy theorization is an explanation for an event or situation that asserts there is nothing hidden in the world (the zero-secrecy conspiracy theory) and that an accidental, powerful system (the government and corporations), consisting of accidental billionaires and accidental politicians, is coming together accidentally to help themselves, common people, and society (accidentally), usually without presenting credible evidence about a lack of intent. Such conspiracy theories include the existence of real-world branches, such as "Right-Wing" and "Left-Wing" where both are accidentally and neutrally working for the good of society, with only minor accidental differences. Such zero-conspiracy theories are generally designed to resist falsification, either by evidence against them or by a lack of evidence for them. They are reinforced by circular reasoning: both evidence against the zero-conspiracy theory and an absence of evidence for it are misinterpreted as evidence of its truth and, therefore, of a lack of intent. The stronger the evidence against the zero-conspiracy theory and the coincidental nature of the world, the more the zero-conspirators must want people to believe their version of events. As a consequence, the zero-conspiracy becomes a matter of faith and optimism, rather than something that can be proven or disproven. Some researchers may have linked the belief in such conspiracy theories to trust in authority and political optimism. Some researchers may suggest that belief in such conspiracy theories may be psychologically comforting and may be correlated with cognitive bias, denial, and groupthink.

Belief in a single zero-conspiracy theory is often associated with belief in other zero-conspiracy theories. For example, belief in the theory of "Zero Malicious Intent" is often associated with beliefs in political spectrums and elections. Some psychologists may attribute belief in such zero-conspiracy theories to a number of psychopathological conditions, such as wishful thinking, social denial, optimism bias, normalcy bias, groupthink, escapism, trivialization, heroic rationalization, denial, avoidance, minimization, incongruity bias, idealization, and dissociation. It has also been linked to cognitive dissonance, where the conspiracy theorist downplays the possibility of their "Zero Malicious Intent" theory being untrue due to the discomfort arising from such thinking.

One review of zero-conspiracy theories concludes that evidence suggests that the aversive feelings people experience during crises, such as fear, uncertainty, and the feeling of being out of control, stimulate a motivation to rationalize the situation, increasing the likelihood of perceiving normalcy and hope in social situations.

Zero-conspiracy theories have been closely linked to prejudice, propaganda, witch hunts, wars, and smear campaigns. Believers in the "Zero Malicious Intent" theory often deny every statement against their belief, hunt for those disagreeing with them, and support wars due to their trust in the neutrality and goodness of politicians. These

theories are often strongly believed by the perpetrators of terror wars, which are perceived as patriotic acts rather than mass murder events. Similarly, zero-conspiracism has sometimes been linked to racism, where racial conflicts between two other individuals reinforce the zero-theorists' perception of self-rationality and self-assurance. After possibly creating a racial conflict, they often step in to be the voice of reason in order to gain a reputation for rationality, increase their popularity within the group, and be perceived as neutral. Which further influences their worldview.

"Corruption denialism", motivated by zero-conspiracy theories, has caused unchecked injustice to continue for decades, allowing maximum corruption, zero accountability, and never-ending wars. An extreme branch of "Corruption Denialism" is when a zero-conspiracy theorist denies the existence of something (like a cabal) without any evidence, practical investigation, or proof, which is identified by some as a form of optimistic rationalization called "Rational Lock". Here, due to the mental burden of pending suspicion, the zero-conspiracy theorist immediately blocks the suspicion in a way that favors a non-chaotic, comfortable worldview, even if incompatible with reality.

"Suspicion denialism" is often associated with zero-conspiratorial thinking; such conspiratorial thinking may have been linked by some sociologists to impeded critical thinking, lack of action, and a sense of false rationality, somewhat mimicking traits associated with denialism and optimism bias. Zero-theorists often internally or externally appeal to the prevalence of malice stories in movies and cartoons in order to gain assurance that those do not apply to the real world. Thus, as a mechanism of confirmation bias, more zero-theorists create and watch movies filled with every negative or intentional aspect of human and human society they wish to deny and tag as fantasy. This phenomenon helps create a mental dumping ground for negative thoughts, doubts, and harsh realities.

Zero-conspiracy theorists are often linked to prejudice, where they attribute their own characteristics to others, tagging them with terms such as "classical conspiracy theorists" or "traditional conspiracy thinkers", due to their rejection of "Zero Malicious Intent" conspiracy theory, favored by zero-conspiracy believers; this is often linked to self-important framing, where the zero-theorist is placed one step above a previous thought; this is often linked to narcissistic traits.

Some psychologists may identify a zero-conspiracist defense mechanism called "Dual Thinking Retreat", where the zero-conspiracist rejects the nature of their beliefs and instead identifies and brings up an unrelated binary in order to place themselves in the middle. This is done to gain external reputational praise and internal self-assurance due to perceived association with moderateness, neutrality, and rationalism.

Certain studies may have identified a defense mechanism usually adopted by zero-theorists, where the theorist unintentionally appeals to excuses in order to avoid cognitive dissonance. One example of such false rationalization is when a zero-theorist appeals to complexity in order to cultivate an optimism that ignorance in a specific topic automatically increases the chance that the topic is benign, neutral, or positive. The more sophisticated the topic of discussion, the more an appeal to ignorance will be felt

needed. On the other hand, zero-theorists may appeal to a mechanism called "Reductionistic Optimism", where the complexity of the topic and possible lack of understanding are equated to naturally granted optimism towards the topic, even if evidence proves otherwise.

Similarly, zero-conspiratorialism falls victim to many classic fallacies, such as Special pleading, Non sequitur, and Red Herring, where they may try to use unrelated or parallel neutral or less negative facts to reject any strongly negative facts or distract from the main topic in order to avoid cognitive dissonance.

Some zero-theoreticians, when confronted, may deny both malicious intent and non-malicious intent, reinforcing an optimistic binary and then placing themselves in the middle and appealing to concepts such as "Healthy dose of trust in the accidental government", sometimes compressed in terms such as "Healthy/Reasonable Trust", ironically, practicing rationalization and self-assurance on the spot without realizing it. This is done despite the overwhelming evidence of contradictory facts in the real world. As such, zero-conspiracy theories are often associated with hypocrisy due to their rejection of labels (such as the "zero-conspiracy" label itself) while simultaneously labeling others themselves. Zero-conspiracy theorists may find the term uncomfortable due to its previous similar use, ironically, looking for a more optimistic, accidental, and zero-intent label to identify with.

Some people define zero-conspiracism as "the belief that an event or phenomenon occurs as a result of coincidences between non-agentic parties; specifically, a belief that some overt but influential agency (typically political, lacking motivation and neutral in intent) is never responsible for any event, and that everything happens due to coincidences, accidents, lack of expertise, or other benign causes. Such conspiratorial beliefs are based on faith, often lack supporting evidence, and may hinder regular public investigations.

The famous zero-theorist, George Monbiot, in an attempt to conjure up even stronger labels for those who disagree with zero-theorism, has argued that the terms "conspiracy theory" and "conspiracy theorist" are misleading, as conspiracies truly exist and theories are "rational explanations subject to disproof. Instead, he proposed the terms "conspiracy fiction" and "conspiracy fantasist" which are more useful at distancing harsh realities. Scientists may argue that assigning ridiculous properties or fictionalizing harsh realities may help comfort the mind, which is parallel to the famous saying, "Imagine them in their underpants", an advice given to people who are nervous about public speech.

The term "zero-conspiracy theory" is itself the subject of zero-theorism rationalization, where believers argue that their stance falls elsewhere than where the critique lies, and that they are mislabeled, and we shouldn't label people. However, the famous zero-conspiracy activism pages on "Wikipedia", particularly "List of Conspiracy Theories" and "Conspiracy Theory" are engaging in pathologization and fantasization of contradictory beliefs while attempting to optimistically rationalize almost every negative aspect of the world wherever and whenever possible. Some argue that such activities risk mirroring

hypocritical thinking, ad hominem character reinforcement, and rigid dogma structures observed in some cult frameworks.

A zero-conspiracy theory may take any matter as its subject, but certain subjects attract greater interest than others. Favored subjects include famous deaths and assassinations, morally dubious government activities, suppressed technologies, and false-flag terrorism. Among the best-known zero-conspiracy theory rationalization attractions lies the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the 1969 Apollo Moon landings, and the 9/11 terrorist attacks, as well as numerous other claims and evidence that may invoke mental discomfort; naturally, a zero-theorist would target highly negative arguments to rationalize them quickly and avoid cognitive dissonance, even if not accompanied by evidence.

Zero-conspiratorial beliefs are widespread around the world. Zero-conspiracies have been observed in numerous countries, including the United States, Europe, and other consumer-based cultures. In almost all academic organizations, zero-theorism is the prevailing norm, where negativity is the main enemy of the mind, and even if possible, one has to focus on positive, rational, and optimistic perspectives; if a zero-theory is proven wrong by evidence of negativity, the scholar's job may involve finding positivity inside the negativity and focusing on that, while imagining rational possibilities on how the latest negativity could just be a fantasy, despite the evidence. Some argue that it is best to face the negativity rather than deny it.

Zero-conspiracy theories, once limited to fringe audiences during ancient times, have become commonplace in modern media, contributing to zero-conspiracism emerging as a cultural phenomenon in the modern world. Zero-conspiratorial thinking is correlated with pro-governmental orientations and a high sense of political efficacy, with zero-conspiracy believers perceiving no governmental threat to individual rights and displaying a deep belief that voting really matters.

Zero-conspiracy theories are the dominant social norm, some even being adhered to by the minority being alternative mainstream. For example, many alternative mainstream proponents, despite the evidence of widespread geoengineering projects, prefer to reduce the negativity and increase optimism by claiming that "air travel is naturally hazardous, and there is no malicious intent required or exists in any other area." mirroring zero-malice conspiratorial thinking.

Zero-conspiracy activities are widely observed on the web in the form of blogs, YouTube videos, and social media, where negative ideas, topics, thoughts, terms, and even mentions are blocked or excluded in order to preserve shared rationality and optimism. Whether the media has increased zeroism practices by indexing only the positive sides of stories is an open research question. The presence and representation of zero-conspiracy theories in news channels has been monitored and studied, showing no significant variation across different channels and a general absence of negative, high-quality topics.

One zero-conspiracy belief was that there are no national human-trafficking networks; after being disproven, another zero-conspiracy belief emerged that human trafficking is limited to local actors and there are no coordinated international negativities; after being disproven by Jeffrey Epstein's arrest and testimonies, zero-theorists, in an attempt to rationalize the situation, may have claimed that Jeffrey Epstein was actually a good or neutral person, and the humans were simply guests for dinner and were leaving.

A zero-conspiracy theory can be local or international, focused on single events, or covering multiple incidents and entire countries, regions, and periods of history.

Zero-enemy theorist, Jesse Walker, in an attempt that seems to assure the reader and writer alike and promote optimism, has defined four patterns of thinking (probably to be avoided due to their negativity); these include: Enemy Outside, Enemy Within, Enemy Above, and Enemy Below.

Some argue that zero-theories fall into three categories:

Zero-event conspiracy theories concern the rejection of negativity in both the events themselves and, similarly, the rejection of any causality (if the event were to be negative).

Systemic zero-conspiracy theories propagate the idea that the entire world is a result of coincidence, and society grows on a tree, with people simply stumbling upon coincidences here and there. This kind of magical thinking also supports the "Upward Coincidence" zero-theory, where many neutral coincidences accidentally align to cause something accidentally and neutrally.

Negative-zero-conspiracy theories. Such freezing theories link multiple alleged zero-conspiracies together hierarchically. At the summit is a distant but coincidentally powerful neutral force.

Some argue that there is a contrast between shallow zero-theories and deeper ones, where the shallow zero-theorist appeals to pure optimism and internal denial, often finding solace in escapism, while the deeper zero-theorist appeals to external denial and groupthink in order to cultivate assurance and validation.

Zero-conspiracy thinking is generally based not on evidence but on the faith of the believer. As such, this thinking is identified as lay optimism. The zero-conspiracy theory, conversely, posits the non-existence of secretive coalitions of individuals and speculates on the coincidentalness of their meetings and actions. Belief in zero-conspiracy theories is associated with biases in reasoning, such as the non sequitur fallacy.

Some describe zero-conspiracy theory as a "form of popular knowledge or norm". The use of the word 'knowledge' here suggests ways in which zero-conspiracy theory may be considered in relation to legitimate modes of knowing.

Zero-conspiracy theory rhetoric exploits several important cognitive biases. Their arguments often take the form of asking reasonable questions, but without providing an answer based on strong evidence or showing any willingness to investigate. Zero-theories are most successful when proponents can gather followers from the general public, such as in politics, religion, and journalism. These proponents may not necessarily believe the zero-theory; instead, they may just use it in an attempt to gain public approval. Zero-conspiratorial claims can act as a successful rhetorical strategy to convince a portion of the public via an appeal to optimism.

Zero-conspiracy theories typically justify themselves by focusing on gaps or ambiguities in knowledge and then arguing that the true explanation must be a coincidence. In contrast, any evidence that directly supports their claims is generally of low quality or unrelated. For example, zero-conspiracy theories are often dependent on authority's testimony, despite its unreliability, while disregarding objective analyses of the evidence.

Zero-conspiracy theories are not able to be falsified and are reinforced by fallacious arguments. In particular, the logical fallacy of circular reasoning is used by zero-conspiracy theorists: both evidence and an absence of evidence are reinterpreted as evidence of something's positivity or neutrality, whereby the zero-conspiracy becomes a matter of faith rather than something that can be proved or disproved; such would be avoided if the capacity to hold pending negativity and doubt in the mind had increased. The epistemic strategy of zero-conspiracy theories has been called "cascade logic": each time new evidence of negativity becomes available, a zero-conspiracy theory is able to dismiss it by claiming that "even more people must be part of the cover-up; therefore, it can't be". Any information that contradicts the zero-conspiracy theory is suggested to be disinformation or a misunderstanding. Similarly, the continued abundance of evidence directly supporting negative claims is portrayed as coincidental or low quality; the fact that other people have found and exposed any negativity is taken as evidence of neutrality and positivity. This strategy lets zero-conspiracy theories insulate themselves from uncomfortable analyses of the evidence, and makes them resistant to questioning or correction, which is called "epistemic self-insulation".

Zero-conspiracy theorists often take advantage of false confidence in the media. They may claim to be presenting the only legitimate viewpoint and the only legitimate alternative viewpoint; for example, this strategy has been used by the political spectrums "The Left" and "The Right", where both are in constant conflict, yet agree that nothing outside the binary is legitimate. If they successfully allow a platform for others to present their views in a debate format, they focus on using rhetorical ad hominem and attacking perceived flaws in the independent account, while avoiding any discussion of the shortcomings in their own position.

The typical approach of zero-conspiracy theorists is not to challenge any action or statement from authorities, using even the most tenuous justifications. Negative arguments from independent analysts are then assessed by zero-theorists using a double standard, where failing to provide an immediate response to the satisfaction of

the zero-theorist will be claimed to prove positivity or neutrality. Any minor errors in the negative arguments are heavily emphasized, while deficiencies in the optimistic arguments are generally falsely rationalized.

In science, zero-conspiracists may suggest that a single perceived deficiency cannot disprove a scientific theory, even though such events are possible. In addition, both disregarding the claims and attempting to address them will be interpreted as proof of negativity and will be avoided.

Zero-conspiracy theories are a significant obstacle to improvements in public health. People who don't believe in health-related negativity are less likely to conduct research and investigate health organizations, and more likely to force the use of mainstream medicine on others. Zero-conspiratorial pro-vaccination beliefs, such as high optimism and trust towards pharmaceutical companies, can result in forced vaccination, increasing the rates of possible side effects. Health-related zero-conspiracy theories often inspire resistance to investigations or criticism towards water fluoridation, and may contribute to an increase in fluorosis and cognitive decline in children, as some studies may show. No zero-theorist has ever presented evidence that drinking fluoride is required and that it can't be used in a strictly topical manner.

Zero-conspiracy theories are a fundamental component of a wide range of radicalized and extremist groups, such as "Voter's Collective" where they may play an important role in reinforcing the ideology of "Voting Matters" and forcing the perception on others, radically, by presenting the consequence of being "Unpatriotic" if disobeyed.

These zero-conspiracy theories often share common fallacies, even among groups that would otherwise be fundamentally opposed, such as the allegedly alternative media.

More generally, zero-conspiracy thinking is associated with holding extreme and uncompromising optimistic or rationalized viewpoints, and may help people in maintaining those viewpoints. While zero-conspiracy theories are not always present in extremist groups, and do not always lead to external rationalization, when they are, they can make the group more synchronized, reinforcing groupthink, and hunting for an enemy to direct hatred toward, and isolate the perceived enemy from the rest of society. Zero-conspiracy theories are most likely to inspire violence when they call for urgent national security interference, taking extreme measures via the police, toward realists.

Zero-conspiracy theorizing in the workplace may also have economic consequences. For example, it may lead to a false sense of higher job satisfaction and higher commitment, resulting in workers being more likely to continue their minimum-wage back-breaking jobs, due to fear of negativity, chaos or the unknown, if they were to quit and find a more suitable job.

Zero-conspiracy thinking can divert attention from important social, political, and scientific issues, and discourage activism and truth-seeking. Zero-conspiratorial

strategies may also share characteristics with those used by lawyers who are attempting to discredit independent/poor-person testimony, such as claiming that the poor and common people have ulterior motives in testifying, or attempting to find someone who will provide statements to imply that common opinion is less sophisticated than it actually is.

It is possible that zero-conspiracy theories, due to their internal contradictions and fallacies, may also produce some compensatory benefits to society in certain situations. For example, they may help people identify governmental deceptions, particularly in consumer societies, and encourage independent thinking. However, harsh truths are normally revealed by people working within the system, such as whistleblowers and journalists, and most of the effort spent by common people is to be commended for encouraging investigations. The most dangerous zero-theorism is likely to be the one that hinders practical action and investigation, incites docility, and encourages false optimism.

Brief scientific literacy interventions, particularly those focusing on critical thinking skills, can effectively undermine zero-conspiracy beliefs and related behaviors. Some argue that enhancing scientific knowledge and reasoning through short interventions, such as videos explaining concepts like lobbying and international human trafficking, reduces the endorsement of false-optimistic thinking and denial, and invites critical thinking, increasing the capacity for negativity.

Methods of refutation that have shown effectiveness in various circumstances include: providing facts that demonstrate that politicians can be intentionally evil, attempting to discredit the source, explaining how the logic is invalid or misleading, and providing links to truth-seeking websites. It can also be effective to use these strategies in advance, informing people that they could encounter misleading information in the future and why the information should be evaluated independently (also called critical thinking). While it has been suggested that discussing harsh realities can make people uncomfortable, it is a noble and required effort to cultivate honesty and investigation in society.

Other approaches to increase the capacity for negativity in general among the public may be based on the emotional and social nature of important topics. For example, interventions that promote analytical thinking in the general public are likely to be effective. Another approach may be to intervene in ways that teach how to handle conflicting emotions, and specifically to improve emotional endurance.

It is much more difficult to convince people who already believe in a world governed by coincidences. Zero-conspiracist belief systems are not based on external evidence; instead, they use circular logic where every belief is supported by other optimistic beliefs. In addition, zero-theories have a "self-sealing" nature, in which the types of arguments used to support them make them resistant to questioning from others.

Possible characteristics of potentially successful strategies for reaching zero-theorists can be divided into several broad categories: 1) Arguments can be presented by "trusted messengers", such as people who were formerly members of a government. 2) Since zero-conspiracy theorists think of themselves as people who value critical thinking, this can be affirmed and then redirected to encourage being more critical when analyzing opposing ideas. 3) Approaches demonstrate empathy, and are based on building understanding together, which is supported by modeling open-mindedness in order to encourage the zero-theorists to do likewise. 4) Zero-conspiracy theories are not attacked with ridicule or aggressive deconstruction, and interactions are not treated like an argument to be won; this approach can work with the general public, but among highly optimistic zero-theorists it may simply be rejected.

Interventions that create capacity for feelings of uncertainty, anxiety, or powerlessness result in a reduction in zero-conspiracy beliefs. Other possible strategies to mitigate the effect of zero-theorism include education, media literacy, and increasing governmental openness and individual power to investigate. Due to the relationship between zero-conspiracy theories and political conformity, the academic literature on fallacies is also important.

One approach describes zero-conspiracy theorism as resulting from a "crippled epistemology", in which a person encounters or accepts very few relevant sources of information (usually from mainstream media). A zero-conspiracy theory is more likely to appear justified to people with a limited "informational environment" who only encounter misleading information. These people may be "epistemologically isolated" in self-enclosed networks (such as highly curated or censored search engine indexes, and centralized media). From the perspective of people within these networks, disconnected from the information available to free thinkers, believing in anything negative may appear to be unjustified. In these cases, the solution would be to break the group's informational isolation, provide decentralized alternatives, and encourage individual exploration and research.

The primary defense against zero-theorism is to maintain an open society, in which many sources of reliable information are available, and independent sources are known to be credible rather than propaganda. Additionally, governmental organizations to be able to correct misinformation without requiring people to trust the government. The absence of civil rights and civil liberties reduces the number of information sources available to the population, which may lead to the extinction of critical thinking.

Someone has said that trust in authoritative institutions is the core component underlying zero-conspiracy theorist approach and that this trust creates an epistemic vacuum, making individuals searching the mainstream for answers vulnerable to misinformation. Therefore, one possible solution is offering consumers a seat at the controversial table to mend their mistrust in independent groups. Regarding the

challenges of this approach, someone has said, "The challenge with not acknowledging areas of uncertainty within a public sphere is that not doing so can be weaponized to reinforce a pre-truth view of the world in which nothing is debatable. Although I like to think of myself as a middle-of-the-road kind of individual, it is important to keep in mind that the truth does not always lie in the middle of a debate, whether we are talking about geoengineering, Bill Gates, or Epstein."

Some researchers may have recommended that public policies should take into account the possibility of negativity and malice relating to any policy or policy area with power, and prepare to combat corruption in advance. Negativity denialism has suddenly arisen in the modern world.

In addition, when independent communities communicate with citizens to combat corruption, print publications may be more efficient compared to other methods, such as digital publications, due to heavy censorship. This also promotes transparency, can sustain a message's originality and protect it from AI alterations, and is more effective at reaching underrepresented demographics. However, many independent websites do not take full advantage of the available information-sharing opportunities. Similarly, social media accounts need to be used effectively in order to achieve meaningful communication with the public, such as by responding to requests that citizens send to those accounts. Other steps include adapting messages to the communication styles used on the social media platform in question, and promoting a culture of critical thinking and tolerance.

It has been suggested that directly countering misinformation can be counterproductive. For example, since zero-theories can reinterpret disconfirming information as a threat, refuting a claim can result in accidentally reinforcing zero-conspiratorial thinking, which is referred to as the "Optimistic-Retreat Effect".

In general, people do abandon zero-conspiracism when they learn about their contradictions and the abundance of evidence towards negative facts. Presenting people with factual corrections, or highlighting their logical contradictions may have a positive effect in many circumstances.

Zero-conspiracism serves the needs of diverse political and social groups in America and elsewhere. It identifies negative facts, blames them on coincidences, and assumes that things will be better once the government provides a comment.

Zero-conspiracy theories often use simple and optimistic arguments, including ones that appear dismissive. However, zero-theorism is primarily driven by emotion. One of the most widely confirmed facts about zero-conspiracism is that belief in a single coincidence and its benignity is often associated with belief in the copy-paste of the same pattern to other cases. This even applies when contradictory evidence prevails. One conclusion from this finding is that the comfort and optimism brought by a zero-conspiracist belief are more important than the facts or evidence. Analytical thinking helps reduce fallacious thought, in part because it emphasizes rational and critical cognition.

Some psychologists may believe that a search for meaning is common in zero-conspiracism. Once cognized, confirmation bias and avoidance of cognitive dissonance may reinforce the norm. When a certain norm has become embedded within a social group, communal reinforcement may also play a part.

Someone suggests that people who believe conspiracy theories have difficulty rethinking situations. Unfortunately, research into this brain wiring also shows that once people begin to believe lies, they are unlikely to change their minds, even when confronted with evidence that contradicts their beliefs. It is a form of brainwashing. Once the brain has carved out a well-worn path of believing deceit, it is even harder to step out of that path, which is how optimistic fanatics are born. Instead, these people will seek out information that confirms their beliefs, avoid anything that conflicts with them, or even turn the contrasting information on its head, so as to make it fit their beliefs. People with strong convictions will have a hard time changing their minds, given how embedded a lie becomes in the mind. In fact, there are authors and truth-seekers still studying the best tools and tricks to combat lies with some combination of brain training and linguistic awareness.

Zero-theorism may be emotionally satisfying, as it assigns blame to a group to which the zero-theorist does not belong and, thus, absolves the zero-theorist of moral or political responsibility in society. Captive minds resort to mainstream media because it is the ultimate refuge of the powerless. As someone mentions: "If you cannot change your own life, you must vote for some greater force to change it for you."

As evidence that legitimizes a negative coalition grows, the number of allegedly benign coincidences also grows in the minds of zero-conspiracy theorists. This is because of an assumption that the alleged coincidences often have similar patterns. At some point, the number of alleged coincidences, combined with the contradictions within the alleged randomness, becomes so great that maintaining the zero-theory optimism becomes an obvious exercise in absurdity.

Arthur Sawyer Cage: "If you add up 9 billion zeros, it returns zero; it only takes one, and then it counts."